

Serial No. 09/933,166

Docket No.: 122.1466

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, new independent claims 99, 100, 101 have been added. Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended, both to depend from claim 99, and, respectively, to set forth alternative recitations as to high versus low potential values of the first and second potential power supply lines of new independent claim 99 which is based on, but is generic to, claims 1 and 9.

Dependent claims 2 and 10 are amended to depend from new independent claim 100 and, respectively, present the alternative definitions the levels of the first and second potential power lines as in the case of claims 1 and 9 and, likewise, dependent claims 8 and 16 are amended to depend from new independent claim 101 and present the alterative definitions of the levels of the first and second potential power supply lines.

New independent claim 102 is based on a combination of claims 1 and 2 as heretofore pending and, in view of the indicated allowability of claim 2/1, claim 102 is submitted to be allowable. Further, dependent claims 103-108 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 102 and, accordingly, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 102.

New claim 109 is based on original claims 9 and 10; since claim 10/9 includes the same allowable recitation as in claim 2/1, it is submitted that claim 109, likewise, is allowable at this juncture. In view of the allowability of claim 109, dependent claims 110-115 are submitted to be allowable as well.

Independent claim 17, furthermore, is amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable dependent claim 18/17 and, accordingly, is rendered allowable in view thereof and in light of which claims 19-25 and 28-32 are, likewise, allowable.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended and new claims are respectfully requested.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF WITHDRAWN CLAIMS 9-16 and 71-98 IS
RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED**

It is respectfully submitted that, whereas the foregoing claims have been withdrawn from consideration, in view of the similarity of the recitations of these claims as evidenced in the foregoing, including the circumstance that allowable subject matter is present in each of the above recited independent claims, all thereof should be reinstated and considered at this juncture. Claim 9 has been converted to a dependent claim, depending from claim 99 and being, in essence, a counterpart or alternative in content to the recitations of the newly

Serial No. 09/933,166

Docket No.: 122.1466

presented, dependent claim 1.

Claim 71, currently withdrawn, differs from independent claim 17, under consideration, solely by the alternative recitations of the low versus high potential power supply lines in claim 71 relative to the high versus low potential power supply lines in claim 17. As is apparent, an independent claim generic to claims 17 and 71 could be presented in which that distinction does not exist -- as in the case of claims 99, 100, and 101 -- but it is submitted that such a claim is not necessary to justify reinstatement of claim 71.

Further, allowable claim 18/17 is a counterpart to withdrawn claim 72/71 -- which, it is submitted, should be reconsidered, and upon such reconsideration, claim 72/71 as now incorporated into claim 71, should result in claim 71 being deemed allowable.

Claims 73-79 and 82-86, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 71, are allowable for at least at the same reasons as claim 71.

Claims 88-89 and 92, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, which is now in allowable condition, likewise, should be reconsidered and upon such reconsideration should be deemed to be allowable.

Claims 90/9 and 91/90, in view of the allowable status of claim 9, as well should be deemed allowable.

Claim 93/17 and dependent claims 94/93 and 95/93, in view of the submitted allowability of claim 17, as amended herein, as well should be reconsidered and held to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 17 is now allowable.

Finally, claims 96/71, 97/96 and 98/96 should be deemed allowable in view of the allowability of claim 71, as now amended and in light of the foregoing comments.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTARY ON PATENTABILITY

Whereas it is submitted that the pending claims herein are allowable, upon reconsideration and in light of the amendments to the independent claims, it furthermore is submitted that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the references to Yamashita et al. (U.S. Patent 6,222,323) pages 2-3 of the Action and Ide et al. (U.S. Patent 6,304,038) as cited at pages 3-6 of the Action, in support of anticipation rejections and at pages 6-7 in support of obviousness rejections of the claims herein.

The rejections on grounds of anticipation are clearly overcome because of the amendments to the independent claims, which introduce limitations which simply are not

Serial No. 09/933,166

Docket No.: 122.1466

disclosed in either of the references.

Yamashita et al. at pages 4-5 is conceded not to disclose "the power distributing circuit being provided outside of the integrated circuit." The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to fabricate the Yamashita et al. power circuit "on another integrated circuit in order to ease the burden on packaging and assembly."

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has overlooked the problem in the prior art, which the rearrangement and restructuring of the circuit in accordance with the invention overcomes -- namely, to overcome the deleterious effects of increased heating as power consumption increases to meet the ever faster driving speeds and larger dimensions of plasma display panels. See, e.g., the discussion of FIG. 4, page 16, line 29 through page 17, of FIG. 5 at page 17-18 and of FIG. 6 at page 18, at page 21 in relation to FIG. 10 at lines 20-25, as to "distributing a portion of the power consumed in the address drive IC...3 to the power distributing means 23 for consumption therein...." See also page 22, lines 10-17, page 2, lines 31-page 23, line 12, et seq.

Accordingly, it is not merely an arbitrary choice or the application of routine skill in the art which leads to the circuit design of the present invention, providing to solutions for the overheating problems. That should be apparent from the fact that neither reference relates to combating the heating problems.

Applicants, furthermore, respectfully submit that the Examiner's broad contentions as to obviousness fail to satisfy the stringent requirements set forth in MPEP 2143-2143.03 for supporting obviousness rejections.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the references of record and, there being no other objections or rejections, that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/933,166

Docket No.: 122.1466

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 22, 2005

By: H. J. Staas
H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 6-22, 2005

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Susan R. Adams

Date 6-23-05